



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,690	04/25/2000	Hung Nguyen	68702	8537

22242 7590 04/27/2004

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SHARAD K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/557,690

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-9 are allowed as based on previous office-action (11/26/03).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tsui (US 6249673), Eisfeld et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsui in view of Kobayashi.

10. Regarding claim 10, Tsui disclosed A method of digitally controlling the frequency of a receiver (abstract) comprising the steps of:

providing a controller for controlling the operation of said signal diode to alter the discrete component makeup of the bandpass filter to adjust frequency; (col.6; 8-25 & 49-67) and

Tsui fails to disclose a bandpass filter. However, Kobayashi teaches in an analogous art, that outputting signals to said diode to alter the bandpass filter frequency. (col.3; 59-col.4; 5) and providing a bandpass filter; (10; fig.1; col.4; 44-50); providing a signal diode connecting additional discrete components to said bandpass filter; (col.4; 44-50) Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a bandpass filter in order to provide an active tuneable band-pass filter.

Claims 11-13, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duhamel in view of Matsubara et al.

11. Regarding claim 11, Duhamel disclosed A method of receiving a receiver actuating signal (abstract; col.3; 21-27) comprising the steps of:

providing a receiver having multiple input devices coupled to a microprocessor (32; fig.1; col.5; 15-21) and receiver circuitry; (20; fig.1)

Duhamel fails to disclose adjusting said receiver circuitry to receive a particular code at a particular frequency based on the position of said multiple input devices and output from said microprocessor. However, Matsubara teaches in an analogous art, that adjusting said receiver circuitry to receive a particular code at a particular frequency based on the position of said multiple input devices and output from said microprocessor wherein adjustment of the receiver circuitry is based, at least in part, on the output from the microprocessor; and receiving said receiver actuating signal. (Col.14; 50-col.15; 8) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include adjusting said receiver circuitry to receive a particular code at a particular frequency based on the position of said multiple input devices and output from said microprocessor in order to provide miniaturization by a single transmitting apparatus transmits repeating codes, the components is simplified.

12. Regarding claim 12, Duhamé disclosed the method of claim 11 wherein one of said multiple input devices is a multi-positioned switch which determines the code to be received as said receiver actuating signal based upon the position of said multi-positioned switch. (Col.3; 56-66)

13. Regarding claim 13, Duhamé disclosed the method of claim 12 wherein another of said multiple input devices is a dual in-line packaged switch (dual in line package; Col.3; 56-66) having multiple inner switches which determines a bit pattern to be received as said receiver actuating signal based upon the position of said inner switches. (Col.3; 56-66)

Applicant's arguments filed on 2/9/2004 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant respectfully disagree about the cited passage in the given references. However, the determination of obviousness is still based upon the above references as follows.

Regarding claim 10, Applicant argues that Tsui & Kobayashi does not teach that outputting signals to said diode to "alter" the bandpass filter frequency. In response, Kobayashi teaches outputting signals to said diode to alter the bandpass filter frequency by appropriately changing the fine tuning voltage. (col.3; 59-col.4; 5) which meets the recited claimed limitations.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant argues that Duhamé & Matsubara et al. does not teach that adjusting said receiver circuitry to receive a particular code at a particular frequency based on the position of said multiple input devices and output from said microprocessor. In response, Matsubara teaches the receiver (4; fig.6) operate at a single transmission frequency, which meets the recited claimed limitations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Sharad Rampuria
April 21, 2004


WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600